ED 155 963 SERVICEMAN'S OPPORTUNITY COLLEGE. A SUMMARY REPORT TO THE CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK, OCT. 1, 1974 THROUGH SEPT. 30, 1975. AMERICAN ASSOC. OF COMMUNITY & JUNIOR COLL., WASH., D.C.; AMERICAN ASSOC. OF STATE COLL. & UNIV., WASHINGTON, D.C. FEB 76 81P.

1 OF 1

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 155 963 HE 009 947

TITLE Servicemen's Opportunity College. A Summary Report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York, October 1, 1974 through September 30, 1975.

INSTITUTION American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.; American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.

SPONS AGENCY Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.; Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE Feb 76

NOTE 81p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Catalogs; *College Programs; Community Colleges; *External Degree Programs; Financial Support; Graduate Study; *Higher Education; *Military Personnel; *Nontraditional Students; Publications; Publicize; Technical Education; *Veterans Education; Vocational Education

IDENTIFIERS *Servicemens Opportunity College

ABSTRACT

This summary on Servicemen's Opportunity College (SOC) reports on the progress of the following SOC tasks: recruitment of additional SOCs; exploring extension of SOC to technical and vocational programs; exploring extension of SOC to graduate programs; publishing and distributing SOC catalogs and other materials; encouraging better liaison among SOC and the programs of each service and between civilian institutions and the military services; providing assistance to the Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support regarding information on self-study, external degrees, and other nontraditional programs; refining criteria, procedures, and report forms; exploring policies and procedures to monitor institutional compliance with SOC criteria; providing for a continuing evaluation of SOC; exploring issues, policies, and means for planning, liaison, and governing civilian education for military personnel; exploring issues, policies, and options for financing civilian education for military personnel; exploring possible civilian applications of SOC; and providing a veteran's education service for institutions. A list of SOC institutions is appended. (SPG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED155963

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AASCU

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SERVICEMEN'S OPPORTUNITY COLLEGE

A Summary Report
to the

Carnegie Corporation of New York
October 1, 1974 through September 30, 1975

HE 009 947

February 9, 1976

Mr. Alden Dunham
Executive Associate
The Carnegie Corporation of New York
437 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022

Dear Mr. Dunham:

I am pleased to forward, on behalf of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, our report on the first year's operation of the Servicemen's Opportunity College (SOC). This particular material reviews the efforts of two-year and four-year institutions and the work done by this office on the educational opportunities for veterans.

In spite of a slow start resulting from delays in signing a contract with the Department of Defense, much progress was made--in new institutions attracted to the SOC network, in facing some of the policy issues that arise with many of the non-traditional efforts of our institutions, and in working with and for colleges and universities in bettering the educational opportunity for the veteran.

The budget squeeze on federal and state governments has made the Carnegie Corporation contribution to this work ever more important. It is important for us to make every effort through the SOC mechanism to assure an increasing standard of educational service to our servicemen and veterans. Thank you for your assistance and concern.

Sincerely,

Allan W. Ostar
Executive Director

AWO:lb

SERVICEMEN'S OPPORTUNITY COLLEGE

A Summary Report
to the

Carnegie Corporation of New York
October 1, 1974 through September 30, 1975

Sponsored by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges to further educational opportunities of service men and women and veterans.

Funded jointly by the Department of Defense and the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Allan W. Ostar
Executive Director
American Association of State
Colleges and Universities
Suite 700, One Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036

Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr.
President
American Association of
Community and Junior Colleges
Suite 410, One Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Brief Review of SOC....1
SOC Progress Report - 1975....4
The SOC Tasks
1. Recruit additional SOCs....4
2. Explore extension of SOC to technical and vocational programs....7
3. Explore extension of SOC to graduate programs....7
4. Publish and distribute SOC catalog and other materials....8
5. Encourage better liaison among SOC institutions and military bases in a selected area....9
6. Strengthen liaison between SOC and the programs of each service; between civilian institutions and the military services....10
7. Provide assistance to DANTES re information on self-study, external degree and other non-traditional programs....12
8. Refine SOC criteria, procedures, and report forms....12
9. Explore policies and procedures to monitor institutional compliance with SOC criteria....14
10. Provide for a continuing evaluation of SOC....15
11. Explore issues, policies and means for planning, liaison and governing the civilian education for military personnel....16
12. Explore issues, policies and options for financing civilian education for military personnel....16
13. Explore possible civilian applications of SOC....17
14. Provide a veterans education service for institutions....18
Summary....28
Appendix....
A List of SOC Institutions - October 1, 1975....
B SOC Criteria....
C SOC Advisory Board....
D ESC/SOC National Task Force....
E Report of Expenditures....

LIST OF TABLES

Table I. SOC Designations......................5

Table II. SOC Designations: Public/Private October, 1975........................5

Brief Review of SOC

The Servicemen's Opportunity College (SOC) has from its inception been a joint civilian and military effort. The SOC plan evolved from an American Association of Community and Junior College program funded by the Carnegie Corporation of New York and launched in 1970 on behalf of returning service men and women, veterans of the Vietnam era. The relatively low use of the G.I. Bill by returning service personnel, particularly by the disadvantaged veteran, was of particular concern. Thus the AACJC project was directed to expediting understanding, to increased use of the G.I. Bill entitlement on the part of veterans and to developing more programs appropriate to the needs of veterans among educational institutions.

A task force representing civilian and military interests was created by AACJC to help guide their efforts. This committee soon discovered the strong relationship between in-service education (voluntary education programs of the services) and post-service education. It realized that much of post-service or veterans education was closely related to aspirations, plans, and study while in service; that education of the citizen-soldier could not be neatly segmented into pre-service, in-service, and post-service study. It found that there were serious impediments to an orderly plan of study by service men and women, impediments arising from the mobility of service assignments, from the service member's part time status as a student, the difficulty in transfer and acceptance of work among educational institutions, the inappropriateness of many campus requirements and practices in admission, evaluating 'other' learning for credit, resident study requirements, as well as transfer barriers. The deliberations on these problems by the task force and AACJC led them to establish the first Servicemen's Opportunity College, a program then directed to two-year or lower division institutions.

The SOC plan, developed by AACJC and the task force, involved the development of guidelines for institutions participating in the program. The guidelines, or criteria, adopted were derived from colleges which had been successful in working with military personnel, and reflected practices which enhanced the ability of service men and women to engage in collegiate work while in service. Community and junior colleges were invited to consider identifying themselves within a network of institutions committed to more effective programs for military personnel and to observe the policies and procedures outlined in the criteria.

The first year's effort produced a network of some seventy community and junior colleges. From this success a plan to enlist similar support and cooperation from four-year institutions was requested.

In 1973 a four-year SOC effort was launched by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities in cooperation with eleven other higher education associations including AACJC. Joint funding was secured from the United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI) and the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE). In the year which followed (FY 1974) more than 100 four-year institutions joined the network. The total of two-year and four-year institutions within the network reached 253 by the summer of 1974.

It was readily apparent that the two-year and four-year SOC efforts should be merged. At the end of FY 1974 funding for the original veterans education effort and two-year SOC launched by AACJC came to an end. Consequently AASCU and AACJC jointly sought and received funding from the Department of Defense and the Carnegie Corporation of New York for a combined two-year and four-year education effort on behalf of service men and women and veterans.

The 1975 project which was approved for funding outlined fourteen tasks or functions. Several are primarily concerned with expansion of SOC membership and extension of program capabilities offered by its member institutions. Two of the tasks are concerned with problems and issues of liaison among institutions and bases. Two others deal with the broader policies of planning, governing, and funding a continuing civilian effort on behalf of the educational needs of military personnel. Another task is to explore the use of the network of SOC institutions for civilian groups who, like the military, have special problems in following a program of study while at work. A major task outlined for 1975 concerned veterans' education since this portion of the SOC program represents a substantial commitment of time and expense.

In apportioning support of the project, it was agreed that DOD would contribute approximately 3/4 (by means of a series of contracts) and the Carnegie Corporation 1/4 (by means of a grant). The Carnegie grant was to be pro-rated over a three-year period (10-1-74 to 9-30-77) contingent upon a continuing effort by DOD. DOD support will require an annual negotiation of contract.

In the assignment of support costs, no DOD/DANTES funds could be directed to 'civilian' activities. Thus, Carnegie funds have supported exclusively the veterans' education function and the costs of a joint Education Commission of the States-SOC national task force which is exploring policy and options relative to planning, governing, and funding of the efforts of civilian institutions on behalf of military personnel. The cost of other functions (with the exception of publication of a SOC catalog) have been shared, with the major contribution coming from DOD/DANTES.

SOC Progress Report - 1975

In preparing this report the SOC staff has elected to offer a progress report on each of the fourteen tasks (as outlined in the application for grant) with special attention to those tasks which are heavily or totally funded by Carnegie, e.g. the Education Commission of the States task force, civilian applications of SOC, and veterans' education. Each task report and final summary will reflect some of the frustrations and impediments as well as the encouraging accomplishments, and will suggest what may lie ahead.

It should be noted that delays in signing the DOD/DANTES contract (signed February 1, 1975, retroactive to October 1) limited the SOC effort. In the interim only the director was retained on salary. The associate director and one program associate were retained as consultants during the early months. Not until June was the staffing complete. Consequently, the FY 1975 SOC effort and expenditures represent approximately 70 percent of the intended effort and allocated budget.

The SOC Tasks

1. Recruitment of additional SOCs.

At current writing (December 1975) nearly 350 institutions have been designated as SOCs; approximately evenly divided between two-year and four-year institutions. Tables I and II indicate SOC membership at selected check points over the past three years.

Table I. SOC Designations

Type	July '73	July '74	(est) Oct '74	Oct '75	Pending Oct '75
Two-year	77	131	135	159	5
Four-year	0	122	130	174	75
	77	253	265	333	80

Table II. SOC Designations: Public/Private, Oct. 1975

Type	Public	Private	Total
Two-year	147	12	159
Four-year	108	67	175
	255	79	334

By the end of FY 1973 AACJC had recruited 77 institutions in the program. This recruitment involved many mailings to AACJC institutions, including the two-year SOC criteria, application forms, a newsletter, occasional publications and the first SOC catalog. A series of regional conferences were also organized and two field workers visiting many institutions and bases personalized the recruitment effort.

The four-year SOC recruitment (FY 1974) was similar but lacked field representatives, had no newsletter and few special bulletins. It did have help in making contact with four-year institutions through the executive directors and staff of the higher education associations cooperating in the program, and from the military services in identifying potential SOC institutions. A 1974 catalog was published and distributed describing the program and criteria and listing both two-year and four-year institutions. By the end of FY 1974, 253 institutions had been accepted for membership.

Because of delay in funding, the 1975 effort at recruitment was limited by its late start. It depended largely on presentations at conferences, a continuing distribution of the 1974 catalog (until the catalog for 1975-76 was printed in December 1975) and help from the military services in contacting institutions with which they worked. An eight page brochure was also published. Much of the staff effort was in "targeted" visits, phone and letter contacts with institutions, and occasionally with state governing or planning agencies. As of the date of this report, 345 institutions are SOC members with about 75 memberships pending.

Although the number of institutions joining SOC is encouraging there are impediments to recruitment which should be considered. One is the Army's Project AHEAD which encourages joint enlistment and enrollment in school. Although the aims of AHEAD are similar to SOC's, this program exacts no specific commitments from participating institutions to attack the larger more complex job of orderly transfer of credit, acceptance of non-traditional study, and development of alternative programs. The launching of Project AHEAD by a single service, with its accompanying national advertising, produced confusion in the field and made SOC recruitment more difficult. Another impediment, arising from staff limitations, is the inability to develop articles, press releases, special bulletins and reports, newsletters, and other publications essential to national visibility.

FY 1976 recruitment can be strengthened by a major effort to increase SOC visibility on campus, at the state agency level, in institutional circles, within the military services, and with the general public through the news media.

2. Explore extension of SOC to technical and vocational programs.

The SOC staff met several times with representatives of vocational and technical programs and other institutional interests, e.g. USOE, NATTS, AICS, Council for Occupational Education (AACJC), Dept. of Army. Discussions with military educational directors indicate that the need for increased institutional support in this area is substantial and immediate. The Army's needs for civilian program support in the technical-vocational-occupational area are much greater than in collegiate degree work.

SOC's role in this area is confused by its origins. SOC from its inception was limited to degree granting (AA, AS, AB, BS), regionally accredited institutions. To serve technical-vocational-occupational needs SOC will need to extend its eligibility to other types of accreditation (e.g. AICS, NATTS, NHSC, COEI, or other specialized accreditation) and perhaps to non-degree institutions.

The issue was explored at a December 1975 SOC Advisory Board meeting without resolution. The SOC staff was requested to research the issues and options and confer with appropriate persons (especially as to accreditation) and report to a Spring 1976 meeting of the Board.

3. Explore extension of SOC to graduate programs.

Discussions with educational officers of the military services reveal a substantial need and readiness to move rapidly into graduate programs. They want programs of good quality, sufficiently flexible to be useful to service personnel. In contrast, many institutions (as represented by graduate deans, etc.) are skeptical and feel that graduate programs cannot lend themselves to the flexibility reflected in the SOC criteria. Even though this is the attitude generally expressed, there are perhaps a dozen or more institutions successfully offering graduate programs for service men and women in limited professional areas.

It may be that criteria for successful graduate work may vary from those developed for undergraduate work just as criteria for technical-vocational-occupational work may differ.

It is proposed in FY 1976 that representatives of institutions which appear to be successful with graduate programs for service personnel be convened with some of the skeptics to explore possibilities, limitations, fields of study, etc. and to adapt the SOC criteria as may be appropriate.

4. Publish and distribute SOC catalog and other materials.

There were two principal publications during FY 1975, an eight page brochure, "Programs for Servicemen and Veterans" and a 1975-76 SOC catalog.

The brochure has been distributed widely among institutions, professional groups and military installations. It is now in its second printing (20,000 copies).

The catalog was seriously delayed by a number of factors: the late contract signing and funding, the necessity for use of consultant help to produce it, and major problems in getting updated information from SOC institutions.

The 1975-76 SOC catalog is a major publication - 446 pages offering substantial information on 333 SOC institutions, grouped by state. Each state's pages indicate principal military installations within the state and the institutions which serve them, both in-state and out-of-state. The data is incomplete but still very helpful, and indicative of the tremendous civilian commitment to the education of military personnel.

5. Encourage better liaison among SOC institutions and military bases in a selected area.

Trying to develop effective working relationships among institutions, their staffs, and educational officers on bases or posts served is a difficult task. In planning for the FY 1975 SOC the director was urged to explore what might be done in a single geographic area to get institutions and local bases more closely associated in program planning, cooperative effort, knowledge of each others' programs, policies and practices. In short, to use a selected area as a pilot project to test how well institutions can develop inter-institutional working relationships and understanding of the range of programs, policies, and practices of each.

Preliminary discussions with military representatives suggested southern California (or San Diego County) for the pilot project. The director conferred with officials of several San Diego institutions, and Navy and Marine educational officers. A proposal was given to representatives of a Southern California Association of Community Colleges and to military education officers of the area to consider sponsoring a cooperative effort jointly with SOC. To date, nothing has materialized. The matter has also been discussed with presidents of the eight institutions that serve Fort Ord in Monterey, California. There has been no positive response as a result of these discussions.

Another year it may be appropriate for SOC to take the initiative in bringing about cooperative effort by working closely with educational units and a single base (e.g. Fort Ord, Fort Bragg) to maximize working relationships and let the pilot program approach wait.

6. Strengthen liaison among SOC and the programs of each service; between civilian institutions and the military services.

This task is the core of the SOC effort - a by-product of every other task. But strengthening the liaison between SOC and the services is complex and delicate. SOC is the newcomer while many service-oriented voluntary educational programs are of long standing. And although SOC was developed primarily by civilian interests, it was developed in concert with DOD and the Pentagon-based educational directorate. Consequently, SOC is perceived as a DOD (or OASD) program, an add-on to the separate service efforts.

While the individual services do not oppose SOC, it is understandable that each service zealously presses its own program first. There are many reasons for this priority: careers are involved, service identity needs to be enhanced, the different branches of the services are intensely competitive, etc. Also, the service-oriented programs have much larger budgets and manpower available than the SOC. To avoid being perceived as being in competition with the educational programs of each service, SOC needs to support the service programs in every way possible - to reinforce them rather than to compete.

If SOC can ease some of the problems each service faces as it seeks educational help from civilian institutions, SOC can be perceived as additional support. This is happening to some extent. SOC staff are increasingly called on to work with military groups, educational service officers, USAF/SAC senior advisers, etc. Several times SOC has been called in to aid in settling disputes among institutions serving a single base. SOC representatives appear on nearly every major program dealing with voluntary education in the military.

Concerning liaison, there are many issues to be faced. The services vary widely in their expectations of civilian institutions. Programs involving civilian institutions are often launched without sufficient consultation as to procedures and policies. Project AHEAD of the Army Recruiting Command is a case in point. It is a worthy program designed to encourage recruits to simultaneously enlist and enroll in a civilian institution and gain an education while in service. It has been backed by an ambitious national advertising campaign. Yet consultation with civilian institutions in terms of expectations, costs, commitment, and continuing responsibility appear to have been minimal. But the success and quality of the program rests almost entirely on the integrity and effort of the institutions which have been designated as AHEAD institutions.

The AHEAD campaign is confusing to many institutions. Some institutions consider AHEAD designation as the equivalent of SOC, yet it lacks much of the broader implications of the SOC program. Also, some AHEAD institutions do not realize that AHEAD is an Army program only while SOC supports all services.

The SOC staff has for some time recommended a defense-wide study of policies and practice in voluntary education programs among the services - a study similar to the Education Commission of the States task force study for civilian institutions described in (11) and (12) which follow. (Such a defense-wide study was authorized in November 1975 and will report by March 1976.) Perhaps from this will come a clarification of policies and needs of the services which will ease the planning of the civilian effort and the work of SOC.

7. Provide assistance to DANTES re information on self-study, external degree and other non-traditional programs.

The Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES), as its name indicates, is charged with a wide range of tasks to enhance self-study and non-traditional opportunities for service personnel. SOC has made its files on institutions available to DANTES representatives, and has sought specific information on behalf of DANTES (particularly concerning non-traditional programs and self-study opportunities) from SOC institutions. Similarly, SOC institutions were the sample of institutions used in determining commonalities of program and courses in the DANTES prototype catalog.

8. Refine SOC criteria, procedures, and report forms.

Criteria

Both the two-year and four-year SOC criteria statements and application forms were reviewed and combined into a single set of forms. Two edited versions of the criteria and application forms were prepared: one with substantial changes in style, the other with minimal changes. The forms with minimal changes were adopted for FY 1976 with an expectation that the more stylized version might be adapted for the following year. It is hoped that the currently adopted forms will be sufficient for catalog and directory needs.

Experience pointed out two needed clarifications of the original SOC criteria. Relative to qualifying for SOC it is apparent there are at least three ways: 1) an institution's overall policies meet the SOC criteria, 2) its overall policies do not meet the criteria but the institution will make appropriate adjustments for service personnel,

3) only certain specific programs have policies which meet the SOC criteria. In each case SOC designation can be justified but any limitations will need to follow the designation.

Relative to the SOC requirement for credit transfer policy, three alternatives were suggested: 1) the institution will accept transfer credit at the level of credit granted by other accredited institutions to the extent applicable to the receiving program, 2) if not, the institution will make special effort to evaluate or validate credit offered for transfer (especially credit earned in non-traditional programs or courses), 3) or, as a minimum, it will accept transfer credits on a provisional basis subject to later successful study.

Office

Considerable effort was directed to the design of an accounting system sensitive enough to provide for the necessary reports to DANTES by task or function and to permit orderly allocation of pro-rated costs to the Carnegie Corporation and to DANTES for each vouchered expenditure.

Following the signing of the DANTES contract, office space was secured and revamped at minimum cost in order to combine a two-year and four-year SOC effort and accommodate a staff of six.

Advisory Board

In the absence of authority to establish the proposed new SOC Advisory Board resulting from the delay in finalizing contract, all available members of the former Four-Year SOC Board and the former Two-Year SOC Task Force were convened for an _ad hoc_ advisory board meeting in March of 1975. The _ad hoc_ group reviewed and discussed project status, documents and related developments and recommended actions to the staff for the balance of the year.

In the early Fall of 1975 nominations were sought from each of the cooperating associations and the military services, and an advisory board of 22 members was established. The project was most fortunate in the caliber of men and women attracted to the Board. They are prominent, informed, and persuaded of the importance of the SOC effort. And they represent agencies or institutions deeply involved in many of the same issues faced by SOC. (See Appendix for listing of Advisory Board members.)

9. Explore policies and procedures to monitor institutional compliance with SOC criteria.

Differences among institutions in the quality of work offered to the military and veterans are readily apparent. Yet there are insufficient means by which to monitor or judge the quality of work offered. Accreditation of an institution is not a guarantee of quality, and correction of abuses may take years. But SOC can give assistance to base commanders, institutions, and students in curbing bad practices and encouraging the good. Discussions with accreditation and military officials suggest that attention is being directed not only to offerings for the military but to all external programs of institutions. Tentative guidelines exist and are being refined; techniques for visiting and evaluating far-flung operations are being explored. But solutions are years, not months, away. Short of this, service officials are requesting that SOC find means to at least check institutional conformance to the SOC criteria. But even this is fraught with problems for SOC as it cannot become another accreditation agency and still serve its other purposes. At best, it can receive and register back to institutions complaints or reports of abuses. It can encourage self-policing among institutions which serve a single base through whatever liaison mechanism exists. It can serve as a neutral party to listen to or arbitrate disagreements or alleged abuses.

To date membership in SOC is only a public commitment by an institution to observe and enforce the SOC criteria in its own actions. It may well be that the SOC must in FY 1976 find means to monitor observance through self-evaluation by institutions, by procedural reports, etc., or possibly through some form of pilot study of institutions serving selected bases to be done by an outside group.

10. Provide for a continuing evaluation of SOC.

To obtain an independent evaluation of the SOC effort, proposals were invited from a number of well known research or study groups from which a single contractor was selected to design and implement the study. In the SOC proposal a first year's effort was set aside for design of the study and development of the necessary instruments: questionnaires, interview schedules, plan of reports, etc. The next two years were to be used to gather, summarize, and interpret the data and render both an interim report and a final report. Once selected, a single contractor would carry out the whole evaluation.

Four fully qualified proposals were received and reviewed by a combined civilian and military panel. Based on the proposals submitted, the Pennsylvania State University's Center for the Study of Higher Education (PSU/CSHE) was awarded a contract for the first phase of the study. After careful consultation with SOC staff, representatives of each of the military services, OASD, DANTES, etc., PSU/CSHE recommended sampling three groups - institutions (both SOC and non-SOC), education officers from all services, and students (both military and civilian).

Institutions, bases, and students to be questioned were to be selected by appropriate sampling techniques. Data from the first two - institutions and bases - were to be sought by questionnaires, and data from the student sample by personal interview. Data sought would cover most of the policies and practices reflected in the SOC criteria.

11. Explore issues, policies, and means for planning, liaison and governing civilian education for military personnel.

12. Explore issues, policies, and options for financing civilian education for military personnel.

    (The above tasks are treated together in this report as they constitute a double assignment accepted by a national task force established by the Education Commission of the States at the request of SOC and funded by SOC with the use of Carnegie Corporation funds.)

In the spring of 1974 many of the issues confronted by SOC were presented to the Steering Committee of the Education Commission of the States (ECS) by the director of SOC. These issues concerned the planning, liaison, governing and funding of the effort of civilian institutions engaged in providing programs of instruction in support of the voluntary education program of the Armed Services. Since postsecondary education is largely a state responsibility the issues were presented to ECS, an organization representative of 47 states and territories which seeks to further working relationships among governors, legislators and educators.

At SOC's request and agreement to cover the necessary costs, ECS created a national task force to examine these issues and problems. The task force, chaired by Governor Edwin Edwards of Louisiana and representative of state legislators, commissioners of postsecondary education, two-year and four-year colleges and universities, the Veterans Administration, the U.S. Office of Education, student veterans, and the Department of Defense, began its work in August, 1975 and plans to report by the summer of 1976.

13. Explore possible civilian applications of SOC.

Civilian application of SOC was intended to include 1) developing a network of institutions able to respond to the needs of an identifiable group not now well-served by traditional programs and 2) extension of SOC-developed capabilities within an institution to all students alike.

The FY 1975 effort did not produce an identifiable application of the SOC principle to a group, e.g. postal employees or Peace Corps. However, civilian applications of SOC-developed capabilities - improving transferability of credit, reconsideration of requirements for resident study, increased use of validating mechanisms for learning gained from other types of training or experience - are on the increase. Almost without exception where institutions have adjusted their policies or provided better means for legitimate exception in order to satisfy SOC criteria, they have applied equally to all students. Similarly, some institutions have been encouraged to develop special programs, e.g. an extended degree, an on-base center, a general studies option, or other programs adapted to conditions of study within the military. These programs in turn have been made available to any civilian group.

Exploration of major applications of SOC has lagged during FY 1975. However, there have been fragmentary discussions between SOC staff and representatives of the Environmental Protection Agency, the AFL-CIO, the Postal Service, the Peace Corps, the National Guard, the U.S. Army Reserve, and the American Institute of Banking (AIB).

At a policy seminar on extended degree programs sponsored by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education of the University of California in cooperation with the American Council on Education and the Education Commission of the States the SOC model was reviewed and discussed as a potential "delivery system" for use of extended degree programs.

Of the above contacts and discussions the most probable civilian application may be to the developing instruction and training programs of the AIB.

14. Provide a veteran's education service for institutions.

(This section is given more space than the other 13 tasks since it is of special interest to the Carnegie Corporation whose funding of SOC was contingent upon a continuation of programs aiding veterans.)

Task 14 Restated

The special concerns and aims of the SOC program for veterans (Task 14) was more broadly defined as follows:

> The veteran, in having to seek out his own assistance and benefits, often becomes discouraged in the midst of bureaucratic complexity. The SOC program is a means through which administrators, education specialists, coordinators and counselors in local veterans' agencies, military bases and institutions of higher education can provide the veteran with what he or she is looking for.

Since veterans, once they are discharged, are in most cases isolated from sources of information relating to programs beneficial to them, SOC has committed itself to compile and disseminate information to academic institutions and other cooperating agencies for use in planning programs for veterans.

SOC has therefore pledged itself:

- -To host conferences for dissemination of veterans' related materials and to promote free-flowing exchange of ideas. Such conferences will also bring officers of federal agencies concerning veterans in contact with administrators of veterans' programs.

- -To produce informational brochures interpreting laws on veterans' programs and to provide any other information which will help institutions to assist veterans in obtaining the educational and other related assistance to which they are entitled.

- -To maintain an information dispensing service, mailing brochures describing programs, gists of legislation and proposed legislative action, or other compiled information to academic institutions, servicemen's or veterans' counselors, or other agencies requesting such material.

- -To produce and supply material which can be made available to the media by SOC institutions in order to reach as many veterans as possible.

- -To be cognizant of and sensitive to the special needs and problems of minority veterans, the disabled, the incarcerated, with particular emphasis on Vietnam era veterans.

- -To disseminate listings of agencies, organizations, and associations that are able to provide specialized services.

-To devise and provide information on model programs for outreach, counseling, and tutorial assistance for veterans' programs.

Veterans contemplating the use of their GI benefits should not only be encouraged to consult their SOC counselor or veterans' advisor as to their rights and entitlements under the legislative acts providing these benefits, but should also seek them so as to obtain the maximum advantage between in service and after service GI Bill benefits.

Staffing

William E. Lawson was secured from the AACJC staff as Associate Director of SOC to assume major responsibility for the veterans' affairs program, two-year SOC interests, and the SOC applications for technical-vocational-occupational programs. Lawson previously served as Director of the Veterans Program for AACJC.

Information Clearinghouse - Mailings and Materials

Seven major mailings to SOC and other institutions were undertaken from March through November 1975. Items covered such topics as SOC programs; the G.I. Bill; "Vet Reps" - the Veterans Administration's man-on-campus program; the Veterans' Cost of Instruction Program (VCIP); and a Digest for use by counselors published by The National League of Cities/U.S. Conference of Mayors. For VCIP alone there were three separate mailings. (A sample of all materials disseminated is included in an accompanying notebook.)

In addition to the major mailings to institutions there were literally hundreds of special mailings to individuals based on phone and mail requests.

Response to the mailings was particularly heavy with regard to the G.I. Bill legislation, the VCIP project and the Digest. Additional copies were requested by many institutions, both by phone and by letter. Many SOC institutions passed the information on to other schools in their area and requests from non-SOC institutions were elicited and responded to.

It is estimated that nearly 1000 telephone inquiries were handled by the SOC office and the Associate Director in particular regarding veterans programs, regulations, and legislation. Because of the proposed termination of the G.I. Bill, the greater number of the calls were requests for information on the effect of the termination, and the status of the legislation.

Another subject of telephone inquiry was the Veterans' Cost of Instruction Program (VCIP) which is a major funding source for veterans programs in postsecondary institutions. The U.S. Office of Education awards grants to institutions through the VCIP to establish full-service veterans affairs offices based upon the number of veterans enrolled.

The remaining veterans calls handled by the SOC office were in regard to employment; PREP (with the termination of the G.I. Bill the PREP program will also be terminated); and discharge upgrading.

Workshops and Conferences

Three regional SOC conferences were held in Chicago, Seattle and Atlanta, respectively. Two were "piggybacked" with other conferences and a one-day SOC only conference was held in Atlanta. Approximately 40 educational service officers, higher education institution representatives and veterans' program administrators attended the Seattle and Chicago conferences, and over 90 attended in Atlanta.

Topics of discussion at the conferences included the "Servicemen's Opportunity College - How It Works, How You Can Work Within It"; "Evaluating Service Experiences for Credit"; "Non-Traditional Education Support"; "Veterans Affairs - National Scope"; "Veterans Affairs - Regional Scope"; "Education and Rehabilitation Services for Veterans"; "Voluntary Education for Servicemen"; and "Developments in Programs and Educational Entitlement for Veterans."

In addition to the SOC conferences the Director and Associate Director made numerous presentations to civilian and military groups concerned with education for servicemen and veterans. The groups included associations of colleges and universities, presidents, chief academic officers, registrars and admissions officers, guidance counselors, vocational counselors, directors of continuing education, veterans affairs officers, etc. Other presentations were made to military groups - recruiters, educational service officers and senior advisors. The Associate Director made presentations to groups such as The National League of Cities/U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Alliance of Businessmen, veterans program administrators, and various veterans associations.

Disadvantaged Veterans

Incarcerated veterans have been a special concern. Since there are currently about 44,000 veterans, in 280 federal and state prisons, who are almost totally unaware of their benefits, this segment of the veteran population is especially in need of SOC's informational program. Incarceration does not deny veterans their educational benefits.

In January of 1974 Associate Director Lawson began working with prisoners at Lorton, Virginia on an experimental or pilot basis. This prison is the medium and maximum security facility for the District of

Columbia. Prior to SOC involvement no mechanism existed for the receipt or deposit of VA benefit checks, although a VA approved institution did offer classes at the facility. Since SOC involvement a group of incarcerated veterans and the D.C. Department of Corrections have cooperated to work out such a system.

Following this success SOC began to inquire as to which of its member institutions were involved with education in prisons. Among SOC institutions Vincennes University Junior College in Vincennes, Indiana appears to have pioneered in this field. They began a degree program at the U.S. penitentiary in Terre Haute, Indiana in 1973 following a year of planning with prison officials. Currently 98 inmates from the maximum security prison are enrolled as full time students, all of them veterans receiving their educational benefits. According to reports by Vincennes staff, academic failure is almost zero. The University of Southern Colorado has a program enrolling 110 inmates of the Colorado State Penitentiary, of which 45 are veterans utilizing their G.I. Bill entitlement. Associate Degree programs in Social Science and Behavioral Science are offered. These programs were jointly selected by inmates, penitentiary education coordinators, and university staff. The USC staff reports a high achievement rate in this program also.

Education for the incarcerated has been determined feasible by SOC and informational and organizational help for prisons and veteran inmates will be continued and expanded.

Minority veterans, expecially those of the Vietnam era, have been of special concern to the various federal agencies working with veterans affairs. This attention has been directed mainly to Blacks, Spanish-speaking, and Native Americans. The Department of Labor, for example, keeps unemployment records not only on veterans, but on minority veterans. The Office of Education has drawn attention to the needs of educationally disadvantaged veterans through its Upward Bound and Talent Search programs, and, of course, VCIP.

SOC has attempted to keep abreast of the developments in this area and to disseminate statistics and information on minority veterans. SOC also works closely with the American Association of Minority Veterans Program Administrators, which Mr. Lawson helped to launch during 1975.

Special Problems and Related Effort

Proposed Termination of G.I. Bill. Although SOC is not a lobbying device, its information gathering and dispensing service has been a help to the veteran and to institutions in their own lobbying efforts.

SOC has put a great deal of effort in dispensing information as to the G.I. Bill since most of the educational opportunities open to veterans derive from its benefits. The impact of the "killing" of the G.I. Bill will not only be to the veteran, but could be devastating to institutions which depend heavily on veterans enrollment and will also affect the employment situation and the economy in general. It is clear that a study needs to be made of the results of such action and its findings made public. SOC and its members and supporters have discussed the feasibility of SOC's conducting or supporting such a study through an agency competent to make such an investigation. The SOC Board at its December meeting urged the staff to explore possibilities for such a study.

If the G.I. Bill is terminated the PREP program for remedial assistance and help in completing high school, which is a part of the G.I. Bill, will also be terminated. This would also be a major blow to service men and women and veterans, since for many it is their only opportunity to become eligible for a program in higher education. There is a PREP-type program being considered which the Department of Defense hopes to initiate in its place should the G.I. Bill be terminated.

Sample Poll of College and Community Reaction to a Probable End to the G.I. Bill. Some three weeks following President Ford's request to the Congress to end the G.I. Bill the SOC office polled by phone a representative group of veterans program administrators to determine the extent of awareness of a possible end to the Bill, the level of discussion and concern among campus and community groups and more specifically to get estimates of the impact upon college, community and future veteran enrollments, if the G.I. Bill is ended. This quick poll indicated that colleges and communities were largely unaware of impending action; that there had been limited press coverage; that there was little discussion and no overt action thus far to continue the Bill. However, they reported that its loss would have a significant effect on future veteran enrollments, e.g. 50-95 percent would be unable to continue in school were the G.I. Bill unavailable to them. (A summary of the survey is part of the materials in the accompanying notebook.)

It is apparent that in the ensuing months no major concern has developed on most campuses and action to sustain the Bill has been sporadic and uncoordinated.

Sample Poll re Proposed Army Scholarship Option. A second poll was conducted the same week (May 19-23) at the request of the Army to gain insight into aspects of a proposed scholarship option then being developed by the Army. In a phone poll of a representative sample of institutions a statement describing the proposed scholarship plan, conditions for eligibility, administrative procedures, etc. was read to respondents who were student aid officers for their institution. In general the respondents felt the scholarship option would be workable and helpful. Constructive suggestions were given and forwarded to the Army. (Note: The scholarship option plan has been shelved for the time being but may be revived if the G.I. Bill is phased out. A copy of the summary is contained in the accompanying notebook.)

VA Regulations. In response to alleged abuses by veterans and educational institutions, the VA instituted a new set of regulations designed to prevent such abuse. These were to guide state approval agencies in determining for the VA institutional and program eligibility under the G.I. Bill. Serious problems arose when interpretations from the various state agencies varied significantly. They not only disagreed with each other but were in conflict with or exceeded the legal authority of the VA to determine or influence institutional programs and procedures.

The new regulations cause many problems, however interpreted. These affect both the veteran and the educational institution. One of these is that the veteran student is required to be program oriented. There is no room for the veteran who does not want credit but wants to learn a skill for his own use. This is also to the disadvantage of the veteran who wants broader knowledge than that included in a job-oriented course of study.

A major problem from the college's standpoint is that the VA rules are discriminatory (for veterans only). The veteran is denied access to many of the newer non-traditional forms of study - extended degree, competency based programs, internships, etc. Under the regulations enrollment by the veteran student requires special bookkeeping on the part of the colleges, in some cases daily attendance -

a procedure most colleges and universities will be reluctant, unable or unwilling to comply with. Further the VA (independent of the college's evaluation) can approve or disapprove a veteran student's academic progress, a condition which exceeds the legal authority of the VA. In addition colleges have been made financially responsible for the veteran's abuse of his benefits - a further adverse circumstance from the standpoint of the institution - one which will make schools reluctant or unwilling to enroll veterans.

From the SOC viewpoint, the new rules and regulations appear to be self defeating. Even financially, with abuses reported by the VA to be about 1.6 percent, it appears likely that the cost of enforcing such regulations will exceed any savings made.

SOC will continue to monitor developments in matters of legislation and regulations and assist institutions to make known their concerns.

Summary

Although the foregoing report reveals a great deal of progress, to the director and staff it has often been a frustrating and disappointing experience. Among the frustrating elements were delays in finalizing the SOC contract with DANTES and Navy Procurement. This limited the program to a minimum office operation during the summer of 1974 and a necessary postponement of staff recruitment until after signing of contract (February 1975). Much of available staff time of necessity had to be directed to negotiating details of contract, establishing office procedures, methods of accounting and report, and therefore less time was available to discharge the functions of SOC.

However, much was achieved in maintaining contacts with appropriate agencies, with institutions and in making presentations to a wide variety of professional meetings, both civilian and military. By the end of FY 1975 the SOC network had been expanded from 253 to 333 members. (As of December, 1975, 345.) Discussions now suggest that SOC should be extended to vocational and technical programs, but serious issues remain relative to required accreditation and degree requirement for SOC eligibility. Increasing a graduate program capability is clearly mandated and will receive high priority in FY 1976.

SOC publications were limited to an eight page brochure, a sharply expanded SOC catalog (446 pages) and the dissemination of many veteran related bulletins. However, it is apparent that other informational materials are needed for both the military and the veterans' effort and must be sharply increased. SOC has a visibility problem which requires a planned public information effort.

Regionalizing SOC - sharpening the liaison among institutions and bases in a geographic area - was explored, but it would appear is reviewing policy, practice and plans in the voluntary education programs of the military services. From these two groups it is hoped that there can be sharpened understanding and much improved working relationships between civilian and military efforts.

The staff of SOC, as well as others associated with higher education, have observed that there appears to be a general improvement in attitudes toward needs of students. Important aspects of SOC - special programs, better recognition of credit in transfer, increasing flexibility in admissions, more appropriate resident study requirements - are now institutionalized in many colleges and universities and available to all. Extension of the SOC network plan to include the educational needs of other identifiable groups of civilians has not occurred even though SOC has been approached by several such groups. However, gains are apparent, even though the job is complex, delicate, and of necessity, slow.

There has been much action in the veterans educational service program. Monitoring legislative and regulatory developments has brought a number of important issues to the surface. SOC has undertaken many major mailings to veterans counselors in both SOC and non-SOC institutions. In regional SOC conferences and in each presentation made by SOC staff to a wide variety of professional groups the staff has sought to link together the voluntary education programs of the services and veterans program and the G.I. Bill entitlement. However, the threatened demise of the G.I. Bill gives serious concern to military officials and institutions in terms of its probable impact upon recruitment, voluntary education, and subsequently upon colleges and universities and their communities in terms of social and economic impact.

The SOC Board and staff are concerned that there has been insufficient discussion of the impact of an end to the G.I. Bill. The staff was asked by the SOC Advisory Board at its December meeting to explore means for a study of both the social and financial impact of phasing out the G.I. Bill as it might affect veterans, institutions and communities over the next eight to ten years.

SOC is now approximately four years of age. It has grown quickly in response to a need to encourage institutions to adjust their offerings and requirements to the conditions of military service and to the issues, problems and potential of the G.I. Bill for the returning veteran. It has been developed under trying circumstances - change of funding source, change of sponsorship, change of leadership and changes in the political and economic scene.

One of SOC's larger problems is the articulation of its functions with the efforts of other overlapping agencies: Project AHEAD, CCAF, NCFA, DANTES and other military voluntary education programs. There are similar difficulties in relating SOC to civilian efforts: CAEL, UWW, NY Regents Degree, ACE/OEC, extended degree programs, competency based programs, among others. To this end the SOC Board and staff will examine the focus and functions of SOC to increase its effectiveness in relating the changing needs of students and the changing capabilities of civilian institutions to supply these needs.

Appendix A

List of SOC Institutions
October 1, 1975

TWO YEAR INSTITUTIONS

1) ENTERPRISE STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE
Enterprise, Alabama 36330

2) JOHN C. CALHOUN STATE
COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Decatur, Alabama 35601

3) GADSDEN STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE
Gadsden, Alabama 35903

4) ANCHORAGE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Anchorage, Alaska 99504

5) ARIZONA WESTERN COLLEGE
Yuma, Arizona 85364

6) COCHISE COLLEGE
Douglas, Arizona 85607

7) GLENDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Glendale, Arizona 85301

8) MARICOPA TECHNICAL COLLEGE
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

9) MESA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Mesa, Arizona 85201

10) PHOENIX COLLEGE
Phoenix, Arizona 85013

11) PIMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Tucson, Arizona 85709

12) SCOTTSDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251

13) ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY/
Beebe Branch
Beebe, Arkansas 72012

14) ALLAN HANCOCK COLLEGE
Santa Maria, California 93454

15) BARSTOW COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Barstow, California 92311

16) CERRO COSO COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Ridgecrest, California 93555

17) CITY COLLEGE OF
SAN FRANCISCO
San Francisco, Calif. 94112

18) COLLEGE OF ALAMEDA
Alameda, California 94501

19) COLLEGE OF THE DESERT
Palm Desert, Calif. 92260

20) DIABLO VALLEY COLLEGE
Pleasant Hill, Calif. 94523

21) GAVILAN COLLEGE
Gilroy, California 95020

22) GOLDEN WEST COLLEGE
Huntington Beach, Calif.9264

23) HARTNELL COLLEGE
Salinas, California 93901

24) HUMPHREYS COLLEGE
Stockton, California 95207

25) LONG BEACH CITY COLLEGE
Long Beach, California 9080

26) L. A. CITY COLLEGE
Los Angeles, California 9002

27) MERCED COLLEGE
Merced, California 95340

28) MONTEREY PENINSULA COLLEGE
Monterey, California 93940

29) NAPA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Napa, California 94558

30) ORANGE COAST COLLEGE
Costa Mesa, California 9262

31) PALOMAR COLLEGE
San Marcos, California 9206

32) SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE
Sacramento, California 9582

33) SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY COLLEGE
San Bernardino, California 92403

34) SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
San Diego, California 92108

35) SAN JOAQUIN DELTA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Stockton, California 95204

36) SANTA ANA COLLEGE
Santa Ana, California 92706

37) SOLANO COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Suisun, California 94585

38) VICTOR VALLEY COLLEGE
Victorville, Calif. 92392

39) WEST HILLS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Coalinga, California 93210

40) YUBA COLLEGE
Marysville, California 95901

41) CANAL ZONE COLLEGE
Balboa, Canal Zone

42) COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF DENVER
Denver, Colorado 80209

43) EL PASO COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Colorado Springs, Colo. 80904

44) ASNUNTUCK COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Enfield, Connecticut 06082

45) MOHEGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Norwich, Connecticut 06360

46) POST JUNIOR COLLEGE
Waterbury, Connecticut 06708

47) QUINEBAUG VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Danielson, Connecticut 06239

48) DELAWARE TECHNICAL & COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Dover, Delaware 19901

49) BREVARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Cocoa, Florida 32922

50) FLORIDA JUNIOR COLLEGE at JACKSONVILLE
Jacksonville, Florida 32205

51) FLORIDA KEYS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Key West, Florida 33040

52) GULF COAST COMMUNTIY COLLEGE
Panama City, Florida 32401

53) HILLSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Tampa, Florida 33622

54) MIAMI-DADE JUNIOR COLLEGE
Miami, Florida 33156

55) OKALOOSA-WALTON JUNIOR COLLEGE
Niceville, Florida 32578

56) PENSACOLA JUNIOR COLLEGE
Pensacola, Florida 32504

57) VALENCIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Orlando, Florida 32811

58) CLAYTON JUNIOR COLLEGE
Morrow, Georgia 30260

59) DeKALB COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Clarkston, Georgia 30021

60) GEORGIA MILITARY COLLEGE
Milledgeville, Georgia 31061

61) CENTRAL YMCA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Chicago, Illinois 60606

62) COLLEGE OF DuPAGE
Glen Ellyn, Illinois 60137

63) COLLEGE OF LAKE COUNTY
Grayslake, Illinois 60030

64) PARKLAND COLLEGE
Champaign, Illinois 61820

65) WILBUR WRIGHT COLLEGE
Chicago, Illinois 60634

66) WILLIAM RAINEY HARPER COLLEGE
Palatine, Illinois 60067

67) KIRKWOOD COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52406

68) BUTLER COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
El Dorado, Kansas 67042

69) GARDEN CITY COMMUNITY/JUNIOR COLLEGE
Garden City, Kansas 67846

70) HUTCHISON COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Hutchison, Kansas 67501

71) JOHNSON COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Overland Park, Kansas 66210

72) KANSAS CITY KANSAS COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE
Kansas City, Kansas 66112

73) HOPKINSVILLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Hopkinsville, Kentucky 42240

74) ANNE ARUNDEL COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Arnold, Maryland 21012

75) CECIL COMMUNITY COLLEGE
North East, Maryland 21901

76) CHARLES COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
LaPlata, Maryland 20646

77) COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF BALTIMORE
Baltimore, Maryland 21215

78) HAGERSTOWN JUNIOR COLLEGE
Hagerstown, Maryland 21740

79) HARFORD COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Bel Air, Maryland 21014

80) HOWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Columbia, Maryland 21044

81) MOUNT WACHUSETT COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Gardner, Massachusetts 01440

82) NO. SHORE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Beverly, Massachusetts 01915

83) SPRINGFIELD TECHNICAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Springfield, Massachusetts 01105

84) WORCESTER JUNIOR COLLEGE
Worcester, Massachusetts 01608

85) ALPENA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Alpena, Michigan 49707

86) LANSING COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Lansing, Michigan 48914

87) MERIDIAN JUNIOR COLLEGE
Meridian, Mississippi 39301

88) MISSISSIPPI GULF COAST JUNIOR COLLEGE
Perkinston, Mississippi 39573

89) CROWDER COLLEGE
Neosho, Missouri 64850

90) LONGVIEW COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Lee's Summit, Missouri 64063

91) MAPLE WOODS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Kansas City, Missouri 64156

92) PENN VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Kansas City, Missouri 64111

93) FLATHEAD VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Kalispell, Montana 59901

94) NEW ENGLAND AERONAUTICAL INSTITUTE & DANIEL WEBSTER JUNIOR COLLEGE
Nashua, New Hampshire 03060

95) BURLINGTON COUNTY COLLEGE
Pemberton, New Jersey 08068

96) MERCER COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Trenton, New Jersey 08690

97) OCEAN COUNTY COLLEGE
Toms River, New Jersey 08753

98) NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY/ Alamogordo Branch
Alamogordo, New Mexico 88310

99) CLINTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Plattsburgh, New York 12901

100) DUTCHESS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Poughkeepsie, New York 12601

101) HILBERT COLLEGE
Hamburg, New York 14075

102) MARIA REGINA COLLEGE
Syracuse, New York 13208

103) MOHAWK VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Utica, New York 13501

104) NIAGARA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Sanborn, New York 14132

105) ORANGE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Middletown, New York 10940

106) ROCKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Suffern, New York 10901

107) STATEN ISLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Staten Island, New York 10301

108) VILLA MARIA COLLEGE
Buffalo, New York 14225

109) CRAVEN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
New Bern, North Carolina 28560

110) FAYETTEVILLE TECH. INSTITUTE
Fayetteville, N. C. 28303

111) MOUNT OLIVE COLLEGE
Mount Olive, N. C. 28365

112) WAYNE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Goldsboro, N. C. 27530

113) LAKE REGION JUNIOR COLLEGE
Devils Lake, N. D. 58301

114) WESTERN OKLAHOMA STATE COLLEGE
Altus, Oklahoma 73521

115) SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73127

116) OSCAR ROSE JUNIOR COLLEGE
Midwest City, Oklahoma 73110

117) SO. OKLAHOMA CITY JUNIOR COLLEGE
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73159

118) HARRISBURG AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Harrisburg, Penn. 17110

119) READING AREA COMMUNITY COLLEG
Reading, Pennsylvania 19605

120) COASTAL CAROLINA REGIONAL CAMPUS
University of So. Carolina
Conway, So. Carolina 29526

121) GREENVILLE TECHNICAL EDUCATIO CENTER
Greenville, S. C. 29606

122) MIDLANDS TECHNICAL COLLEGE
Columbia, S. C. 29250

123) SUMTER AREA TECHNICAL COLLEGE
Sumter, S. C. 29150

124) TRI-COUNTY TECHNICAL EDUCATION CENTER
Pendleton, S. C. 29670

125) TRIDENT TECHNICAL COLLEGE
North Charleston, S.C. 29411

126) UNIVERSITY OF SO. CAROLINA
Regional Campuses for
Military Programs
  (1) Charleston Navy, S. C. 29404
  (2) Fort Jackson, S. C. 29207
  (3) Myrtle Beach AFB, S. C. 29577
  (4) Parris Island and Beaufort Marine, S. C. 29903
  (5) Shaw AFB, S. C. 29152

127) SHELBY STATE COMMUNITY COLLEG
Memphis, Tennessee 38122

128) STATE TECHNICAL INSTITUTE AT MEMPHIS
Memphis, Tennessee 38128

129) BEE COUNTY COLLEGE
Beeville, Texas 78102

130) CENTRAL TEXAS COLLEGE
Killeen, Texas 76541

131) COOKE COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE
Gainesville, Texas 76240

132) DALLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
DISTRICT
Dallas, Texas 75202

133) EASTFIELD COLLEGE
Mesquite, Texas 75149

134) EL CENTRO COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Dallas, Texas 75202

135) EL PASO COMMUNITY COLLEGE
El Paso, Texas 79905

136) HOWARD COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE
Big Spring, Texas 79720

137) MOUNTAIN VIEW COLLEGE
Dallas, Texas 75211

138) RICHLAND COLLEGE
Dallas, Texas 75202

139) ST. PHILIP'S COLLEGE
San Antonio, Texas 78203

140) SOUTH PLAINS COLLEGE
Levelland, Texas 79336

141) GERMANNA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Locust Grove, Virginia 22508

142) JOHN TYLER COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Chester, Virginia 23831

143) NORTHERN VIRGINIA COMMUNITY
COLLEGE
Annandale, Virginia 22003

144) THOMAS NELSON COMMUNITY
COLLEGE
Hampton, Virginia 23366

145) TIDEWATER COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Portsmouth, Virginia 23703

146) BIG BEND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Moses Lake, Washington 98837

147) FORT STEILACOOM COMMUNITY
COLLEGE
Tacoma, Washington 98499

148) OLYMPIC COLLEGE
Bremerton, Washington 98310

✓ 149) SEATTLE CENTRAL COMMUNITY
COLLEGE
Seattle, Washington 98122

150) SKAGIT VALLEY COLLEGE
Mount Vernon, Wa. 98273

151) SPOKANE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Spokane, Washington 99202

152) SPOKANE FALLS COMMUNITY
COLLEGE
Spokane, Washington 99204

153) TACOMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Tacoma, Washington 98465

154) WASHINGTON TECHNICAL
INSTITUTE
Washington, D. C. 20008

ADDITIONS TO TWO-YEAR INSTITUTION LIST

7/22/75 COLUMBIA JUNIOR COLLEGE
Columbia, Calif. 95310

7/22/75 MIRA COSTA COLLEGE
Oceanside, Calif. 92054

7/22/75 VINCENNES UNIVERSITY-JUNIOR COLLEGE
Vincennes, Indiana 47591

7/22/75 WILKES COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Wilkesboro, N. C. 28697

7/28/75 BEAUFORT COUNTY TECHNICAL INSTITUTE
Washington, N. C. 27889

2/76

FOUR YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Alabama

AUBURN UNIVERSITY AT MONTGOMERY
Montgomery, Alabama 36109

LIVINGSTON UNIVERSITY
Livingston, Alabama 35470

TROY STATE UNIVERSITY/Fort Rucker
Fort Rucker, Alabama 36360

Alaska

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA AT ANCHORAGE
Anchorage, Alaska 99504

Arkansas

OUACHITA BAPTIST UNIVERSITY
Arkadelphia, Arkansas 71923

California

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE/
San Bernardino
San Bernardino, California 92407

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE/
Stanislaus
Turlock, California 95380

CHAPMAN COLLEGE
Orange, California 92666

GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY
San Francisco, California 94105

LA VERNE COLLEGE
LaVerne, California 91750

MONTEREY INSTITUTE OF FOREIGN
STUDIES
Monterey, California 93940

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY
San Diego, California 92108

PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY
Santa Ana, California 92703

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY
San Diego, California 92182

UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO
San Diego, California 92110

U.S. INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
San Diego, California 92131

Colorado

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521

METROPOLITAN STATE COLLEGE
Denver, Colorado 80204

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN
COLORADO
Pueblo, Colorado 81001

Connecticut

UNIVERSITY OF HARTFORD
West Hartford, Conn. 06117

District of Columbia

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C. 20016

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C. 20006

Florida

EMBRY-RIDDLE AERONAUTICAL U.
Daytona Beach, Fla. 32015

FLORIDA INSTITUTE OF
TECHNOLOGY
Melbourne, Florida 32901

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL U.
Miami, Florida 33144

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

ROLLINS COLLEGE
Winter Park, Florida 32789

SAINT LEO COLLEGE
Saint Leo, Florida 33574

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA
Jacksonville, Florida 32216

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA
Tampa, Florida 33620

UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA
Pensacola, Florida 32504

Georgia

ARMSTRONG STATE COLLEGE
Savannah, Georgia 31406

AUGUSTA COLLEGE
Augusta, Georgia 30904

COLUMBUS COLLEGE
Columbus, Georgia 31907

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA
Athens, Georgia 30302

Hawaii

CHAMINADE COLLEGE OF HONOLULU
Honolulu, Hawaii 96816

Idaho

IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY
Pocatello, Idaho 83201

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO
Moscow, Idaho 83843

Illinois

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
Charleston, Illinois 61920

GOVERNORS STATE UNIVERSITY
Park Forest, Illinois 60466

LEWIS UNIVERSITY
Lockport, Illinois 60441

McKENDREE COLLEGE
Lebanon, Illinois 62254

NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS U.
Chicago, Illinois 60625

ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY
Chicago, Illinois 60605

SANGAMON STATE UNIVERSITY
Springfield, Illinois 62703

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
at EDWARDSVILLE
Edwardsville, Illinois 62026

WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
Macomb, Illinois 61455

Indiana

BALL STATE UNIVERSITY
Muncie, Indiana 47306

INDIANA CENTRAL COLLEGE
Indianapolis, Indiana 46227

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

PURDUE UNIVERSITY
at FORT WAYNE
Fort Wayne, Indiana 46805

UNIVERSITY OF EVANSVILLE
Evansville, Indiana 47702

ST. MARY-OF-THE-WOODS COLLEGE
St. Mary-of-the Woods, Ind.
47876

Iowa

COORDINATED OFF-CAMPUS
DEGREE PROGRAM
UPPER IOWA UNIVERSITY
Fayette, Iowa 52142

Kansas

BENEDICTINE COLLEGE
Atchison, Kansas 66002

KANSAS NEWMAN COLLEGE
Wichita, Kansas 67213

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas 66502

KANSAS WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Santa Fe at Claflin
Salina, Kansas 67401

OTTAWA UNIVERSITY
Ottawa, Kansas 66067

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY
Wichita, Kansas 67208

Kentucky

EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY
Richmond, Kentucky 40475

MOREHEAD STATE UNIVERSITY
Morehead, Kentucky 40351

MURRAY STATE UNIVERSITY
Murray, Kentucky 42071

SPALDING COLLEGE
Louisville, Kentucky 40203

WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY
Bowling Green, Kentucky 42101

Louisiana

LOUISIANA COLLEGE
Pineville, Louisiana 71360

NORTHWESTERN STATE UNIVERSITY
of LOUISIANA
Natchitoches, Louisiana 71457

Maine

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE/Ft. Kent
Fort Kent, Maine 04743

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE/Presque Isle
Presque Isle, Maine 04769

aryland

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND
St. Mary's, Maryland 20686

SALISBURY STATE COLLEGE
Salisbury, Maryland 21801

TOWSON STATE COLLEGE
Baltimore, Maryland 21204

UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND/
University College
College Park, Maryland 20742

Massachusetts

BOSTON UNIVERSITY/Metro. Campus
Boston, Massachusetts 02215

NORTH ADAMS STATE COLLEGE
North Adams, Massachusetts 01247

WESTERN NEW ENGLAND COLLEGE
Springfield, Massachusetts 01119

Michigan

CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
Mt. Pleasant, Michigan 48859

EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
Ypsilanti, Mighigan 48197

LAKE SUPERIOR STATE COLLEGE
Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan 49783

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL U.
Houghton, Michigan 49931

NORTHERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
Marquette, Michigan 49885

SIENA HEIGHTS COLLEGE
Adrian, Michigan 49221

Minnesota

BEMIDJI STATE COLLEGE
Bemidji, Minnesota 56601

METROPOLITAN STATE UNIVERSITY
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

MOORHEAD STATE COLLEGE
Moorhead, Minnesota 56560

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE
Winona, Minnesota 55987

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE/U. of MINN.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

WINONA STATE COLLEGE
Winona, Minnesota 55987

Missouri

CENTRAL MISSOURI STATE U.
Warrensburg, Missouri 64093

COLUMBIA COLLEGE
Columbia, Missouri 65201

CULVER-STOCKTON COLLEGE
Canton, Missouri 63435

DRURY COLLEGE
Springfield, Missouri 65802

MISSOURI VALLEY COLLEGE
Marshall, Missouri 65340

NORTHWEST MISSOURI STATE U.
Maryville, Missouri 64468

PARK COLLEGE
Kansas City, Missouri 64152

WEBSTER COLLEGE
St. Louis, Missouri 63119

Montana

COLLEGE OF GREAT FALLS
Great Falls, Montana 59405

EASTERN MONTANA COLLEGE
Billings, Montana 59101

ebraska

CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY
Omaha, Nebraska 68178

KEARNEY STATE COLLEGE
Kearney, Nebraska 68847

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA/
Omaha
Omaha, Nebraska 68101

New Jersey

KEAN COLLEGE OF NEW JERSEY
Union, New Jersey 07083

THOMAS EDISON COLLEGE
Trenton, New Jersey 08638

New Mexico

EASTERN NEW MEXICO UNIVERSITY
Portales, New Mexico 88130

NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88003

New York

ALFRED UNIVERSITY
Alfred, New York 14802

THE COLLEGE OF SAINT ROSE
Albany, New York 12203

ELMIRA COLLEGE
Elmira, New York 14901

EMPIRE STATE COLLEGE
Saratoga Springs, New York
12866

LADYCLIFF COLLEGE
Highland Falls, New York 10928

LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY
Brooklyn Center
Brooklyn, New York 11201

MEDAILLE COLLEGE
Buffalo, New York 14214

N.Y. INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
Old Westbury, New York
11568

NYSDE/REGENTS
Albany, New York 12210

NIAGARA UNIVERSITY
Niagara University, New York
14109

SKIDMORE COLLEGE - U.W.W.
Saratoga Springs, New York
12866

SUNY/BROCKPORT
Brockport, New York 14420

SUNY COLLEGE OF ARTS &
SCIENCES
Plattsburg, New York 12901

SUNY/UTICA-ROME
Utica, New York 13502

North Carolina

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
Greenville, North Carolina 27834

ELIZABETH CITY STATE UNIVERSITY
Elizabeth City, North Carolina 27909

FAYETTEVILLE STATE UNIVERSITY
Fayetteville, North Carolina 28301

NC AGRL & TECH STATE UNIVERSITY
Greensboro, North Carolina 27411

PFEIFFER COLLEGE
Misenheimer, North Carolina 28109

North Dakota

MINOT STATE COLLEGE
Minot, North Dakota 58701

Ohio

OHIO DOMINICAN COLLEGE
Columbus, Ohio 43219

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
Columbus, Ohio 43210

OHIO UNIVERSITY
Athens, Ohio 45701

UNION OF EXPERIMENTAL
COLLEGES AT ANTIOCH
Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387

UNIVERSITY OF AKRON
Akron, Ohio 44325

WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY
Dayton, Ohio 45431

Oklahoma

CAMERON UNIVERSITY
Lawton, Oklahoma 73501

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
Norman, Oklahoma 73069

Pennsylvania

BLOOMSBURG STATE COLLEGE
Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania 17815

LA ROCHE COLLEGE
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15237

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
Capitol Campus
Middletown, Pa. 17057

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY
Philadelphia, Pa. 19122

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15260

YORK COLLEGE OF PENNSYLVANIA
York, Pennsylvania 17405

Rhode Island

RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE
Providence, Rhode Island
02908

South Carolina

BAPTIST COLLEGE AT CHARLESTON
Charleston, S.C. 29411

COKER COLLEGE
Hartsville, S.C. 29550

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
Columbia, S.C. 29208

South Dakota

BLACK HILLS STATE COLLEGE
Spearfish, South Dakota
57783

SOUTH DAKOTA SCHOOL OF MINES
& TECHNOLOGY
Rapid City, S.D. 57701

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY
Brookings, S.D. 57006

Tennessee

AUSTIN PEAY STATE UNIVERSITY
Clarksville, Tennessee 37040

EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIV.
Johnson City, Tennessee 37601

TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY
Nashville, Tennessee 37203

Texas

AMERICAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
Killeen, Texas 76541

INCARNATE WORD COLLEGE
San Antonio, Texas 78209

MCMURRY COLLEGE
Abilene, Texas 79605

MIDWESTERN UNIVERSITY
Wichita Falls, Texas 76308

OUR LADY OF THE LAKE COLLEGE
San Antonio, Texas 78285

ST. EDWARD'S UNIVERSITY
Austin, Texas 78704

ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY
San Antonio, Texas 78284

SUL ROSS STATE UNIVERSITY
Alpine, Texas 79830

TEXAS LUTHERAN COLLEGE
Seguin, Texas 78155

WAYLAND BAPTIST COLLEGE
Plainview, Texas 79072

Utah

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah 84321

WEBER STATE COLLEGE
Ogden, Utah 84403

Vermont

CASTLETON STATE COLLEGE
Castleton, Vermont 05735

Virginia

CHRISTOPHER NEWPORT COLLEGE
Newport News, Virginia 23606

HAMPTON INSTITUTE
Hampton, Virginia 23668

LYNCHBURG COLLEGE
Lynchburg, Virginia 24504

MARY WASHINGTON COLLEGE
Fredricksburg, Virginia 22401

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY
Norfolk, Virginia 23508

VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH U.
Richmond, Virginia 23284

VIRGINIA STATE COLLEGE
Petersburg, Virginia 23803

Washington

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE
COLLEGE
Ellensburg, Washington
98926

EASTERN WASHINGTON STATE
COLLEGE
Cheney, Washington 99004

West Virginia

DAVIS & ELKINS COLLEGE
Elkins, West Virginia 26241

MARSHALL UNIVERSITY
Huntington, W. Va. 25701

SHEPHERD COLLEGE
Shepherdstown, W. Va. 25443

Wisconsin

EDGEWOOD COLLEGE
Madison, Wisconsin 53711

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN/
Greenbay
Greenbay, Wisconsin 54302

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN/
Oshkosh
Oshkosh, Wisconsin 54901

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN/
Stevens Point
Stevens Point, Wisconsin 54481

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN/
Stout
Menominee, Wisconsin 54751

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN/
Superior
Superior, Wisconsin 54880

Appendix B

SOC Criteria

[illegible] Association
of [illegible] Colleges
and Universities
Suite [illegible]
One Dupont Circle
Washington D C 20036
(202) 293-7070

James F Nickerson
Director / SOC

SOC

SERVICEMEN'S OPPORTUNITY COLLEGE

American Association
of Community and
Junior Colleges
Suite 410
One Dupont Circle
Washington D C 20036
(202) 293-7050

William E Lawson
Associate Director / SOC

Dear Mr. President:

The Servicemen's Opportunity College described in the enclosed materials has demonstrated its timeliness by its growth. In the last two years SOC has more than tripled its membership. Not only two-year colleges and vocational schools, but all of higher education is beginning to recognize the extent to which the modern military establishment is dependent on education.

The SOC program is attempting to bring about the coordination of institutions involved in the education of men and women while in military service. As a former university president I understand the difficulties involved in the cooperation of such divergent institutions. But, also, because of past experience, I recognize the need of such cooperation in order to make education for the service man and woman possible.

Proximity to a military base is not necessary for participation in this program. Any SOC institution can serve students from its area while they are in military service, as you will understand from reading the materials. The SOC program also includes post-service education for veterans.

Participation in SOC at some level may be highly advantageous to your institution and its students.

Sincerely,

James F. Nickerson
Director, SOC

Cooperating Agencies

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers

American Association for Higher Education

Association of American Universities

American Council on Education

Association of American Colleges

Education Commission of the States

Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education*

National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education

National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges

National Commission on Accrediting*

State Higher Education Executive Officers

U S Air Force

U S Army

U S Marine Corps

U S Navy

Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense

*now combined into Council on Postsecondary Accreditation

American Association
of State Colleges
and Universities
Suite 700
One Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 293-7070

SOC
SERVICEMEN'S OPPORTUNITY COLLEGE

American Association
of Community and
Junior Colleges
Suite 410
One Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 293-7050

James F. Nickerson
Director/SOC

William E. Lawson
Associate Director/SOC

Cooperating Agencies

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers

American Association for Higher Education

Association of American Universities

American Council on Education

Association of American Colleges

Education Commission of the States

Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education*

National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education

National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges

National Commission on Accrediting*

State Higher Education Executive Officers

U.S. Air Force

U.S. Army

U.S. Marine Corps

U.S. Navy

Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense

*now combined into Council on Postsecondary Accreditation

Education within Military Service

The increasing technological and managerial complexities of the military establishment continually require a higher level of education and training for its personnel. Not only is quality of performance of military assignments dependent on education, but career advancement requires further training. Education, including higher education, is now a necessary element of the defense program. Ending the draft has also added importance to education within the Services. Half of entering recruits indicate a chance to learn a skill, gain an education, attend college, were their prime reasons for enlistment.

In response to this need, education of service men and women (and veterans of such service) has become a joint responsibility of military and civilian interests. And as a matter of national policy, civilian colleges and universities have assumed a substantial portion of this educative responsibility, e.g. ROTC programs, study programs at a thousand locations around the world on bases, aboard ship or at remote missile sites; high school completion or advanced degree opportunities; validation of learning gained from military experience; as well as helping the service men and women to plan and follow programs of study consistent with the demands and limitations of military service. Approximately half a million military personnel are taking some form of work from civilian institutions under the voluntary education program of the Services. And more than a million veterans are students in civilian higher education institutions, many of them completing programs begun during service.

The Role of Civilian Institutions

Civilian institutions, by their commitment to a variety of educational opportunities for service men and women and veterans, have shown their willingness to cooperate - consistent with their location, their curricula, and the quality of student their curricula require.

Many institutions located near military bases provide programs on base. Others, often by special arrangement with one of the military services, have provided programs to a series of installations both at home and away, including overseas.

SOC Form/76-101

Some institutions have programs of study highly adaptable to military service conditions - external degrees, guided self-study opportunity, means to validate prior learning, or competence-based curricula. Many of these programs are useful to service personnel who are unable to study continuously at a single institution or to complete a program because of mobile assignments or isolation.

Unrecognized by many colleges and universities is the opportunity to help service men and women from their own area to plan and follow a program of study while in service that may entail work from several institutions. Such help would involve special counselling, planned transfer of work among institutions, validation of non-classroom work where applicable, etc. This latter role may be an institution's principal contribution, particularly if it is remote from any military installation.

The Role of SOC

It is the purpose of SOC to encourage and coordinate such programs - not only for the educational advantage of the students enrolled, but by increasing the consistency of quality and requirements of programs to ease administrative tasks for the institutions themselves. SOC also seeks to increase educational opportunities by engaging more institutions in the program - not only two-year and four-year, but vocational institutions and graduate schools as its program develops.

In turn, SOC helps to publicize participating institutions and programs, and publishes a directory describing member institutions and available programs. SOC will also help member institutions develop promising and effective programs related to the bases they serve and in many ways tries to strengthen and clarify the working relationship between the civilian and military educational interests.

SOC is also responsible for developing criteria for the conditions and standards which, if complied with, make correlation and coordination possible among member institutions.

Aim of SOC Criteria

The policies and procedures reflected in SOC criteria were derived from colleges and universities which have a history of effective response to the educational needs of service men and women.

The criteria recognize that the first responsibility of service personnel is to their assignments and that any educational programs they pursue must, of necessity, be adaptable to the mobility and unpredictability of their duty assignments.

In general, member institutions are asked to be genuinely responsive to the needs of service men and women - in instruction, in program advisement and counselling, in admission and in resident study requirements, and in cooperative liaison among themselves and military bases. The institutions are expected to make every attempt to maximize evaluation of credits from other work or other learning, however gained, minimize loss of credits wherever possible and, in general, make it possible for an unpredictably mobile student to complete a program.

An educational institution may participate in SOC at various levels:

1. If present overall policies and procedures meet the criteria, SOC designation and approval will apply without reservation.
2. If its present overall policies do not meet the criteria but it will commit itself to making the appropriate adjustments for service men and women, SOC designation will be granted, with a statement as to this commitment in the directory.
3. If it has specific programs only which meet SOC criteria, it will be granted SOC designation, with a statement as to applicable programs in the directory.

Specific criteria for admission to SOC refer to:

I Flexibility of entrance requirements
II Increased study opportunity
III Opportunity to complete interrupted work
IV Special academic assistance
V Credit for learning from in-service educational experience
VI Adaptability of requirements for resident study
VII Credit transfer policy
VIII Liaison among institutions and military bases
IX Publicizing of SOC opportunities
X Continuity of commitment

Making Application for SOC Membership

The following pages contain forms for applying for SOC membership. The first form, the Institutional Agreement Form, is general and is the form which is signed by the chief administrator of the institution. This is supplemented by a questionnaire on conformance to criteria.

A statement of each criterion (Flexibility of Entrance Requirements, etc.) is followed by questions pertaining to institutional policy and practice. The questions and criteria are necessarily complex because of the wide variations in policies and procedures among answering institutions; but it is hoped that placing questions and relevant criteria together will make a difficult task easier.

SERVICEMEN'S OPPORTUNITY COLLEGE

INSTITUTIONAL AGREEMENT FORM

In recognition of the unique educational problems confronting many active-duty service men and women in obtaining their educational goals and in acceptance of our institutional responsibility to remove any unnecessary barriers, our institution hereby concurs in the SOC criteria and expresses its desire to become a Servicemen's Opportunity College.

The SOC Criteria have been carefully reviewed by the appropriate college/university officials and other groups including the governing board (where necessary). We have indicated the means by which the institution has sought to meet these Criteria for service men and women.

We pledge our continuing effort to fulfill our educational commitment to service men and women in the application of the standards and procedures specified in these Criteria and will continue to seek new and promising approaches which will better meet the educational needs of service men and women.

Signature - Chief Administrative Officer

Name and Title
Chief Administrative Officer

Institution

Address

Date

Other campuses or base
education centers covered
by this agreement

SOC Form/76-102

SERVICEMEN'S OPPORTUNITY COLLEGE

INSTITUTIONAL APPLICATION FORM

Institution	Respondent
	Title/phone
Central Administrative Address	

Note: If this information covers more than one campus or base education center, you may append extra pages as necessary or you may elect to submit a separate Institutional Application form for each.

SOC Form/76-103

I. Flexibility of Entrance Requirements

Criterion I - A Servicemen's Opportunity College (SOC) will have entrance requirements sufficiently flexible to adapt to the wide range of age, education, and experience of service men and women.

- A high school diploma or equivalency based upon appropriate scores in the General Educational Development Tests is an adequate educational credential for enrollment in a degree program except in those instances where further qualifications are required of all students for institutional admission or for entry into a particular program.
- In those colleges not restricted by state or local regulations the above requirement may be waived and students evidencing unusual promise may be admitted despite lack of a high school diploma or equivalency certificate.
- An Associate Degree awarded by an accredited* institution will be completely transferable where appropriate to the program of study to be pursued. Requirements of the program of study may in some cases call for additional background courses, but repeating previously completed work will be avoided.
- In no instance will an individual be subjected to additional requirements because he or she is in service.

---

* When accreditation of the transferring institution is pending, the receiving institution may recognize all or part of an individual's work on a case-by-case basis.

Indicate requirements for institutional admission.
(Class rank? Age? Minimum test scores? etc.)

Is waiver or petition possible for service men and women? ____
Under what conditions or procedures?

Does the institution accept in transfer an Associate Degree from an accredited lower division institution? ____ Note any exceptions.

II. Increased Study Opportunity

Criterion II - A Servicemen's Opportunity College provides opportunities for service men and women to pursue educational programs through a variety of traditional and non-traditional means - on campus or on base - in a variety of instructional or study modes and at times or places appropriate to their duty assignments.

Offerings on base. If your institution serves a military base, indicate the nature and extent of offerings, e.g. major program areas, average number of courses per year offered on base, estimated number of service personnel enrolled per year, etc. Please attach descriptive brochures or schedule of courses for each base served.

On-campus opportunities. How far is your campus from the base? ____________ What forms of transportation are available to service personnel during off duty hours?

Please indicate the number of courses (late afternoon, evening, weekend, or other scheduling consistent with service work assignment) which would be of particular interest to service men and women.

To what extent are base personnel availing themselves of these opportunities?

Other adaptable or usable programs. Describe briefly any programs which are particularly adaptable to the needs of service men and women - extended degree, non-traditional, non-classroom, self study, contract for degree, etc.

III. Opportunity to Complete Interrupted Work

Criterion III - A Servicemen's Opportunity College provides opportunities for service men and women to complete study interrupted by military obligations whether of short-term duration or by long-term reassignment. Special options, tests, correspondence, or independent study and similar modes of instruction may prove necessary.

Short term duty. What means and what assistance are available to a military student to make up class work missed because of duty assignment?

Transfer of assignment. What options, assistance, and encouragement are available to the transferring military student to continue and complete his program of study?

IV. Special Academic Assistance

Criterion IV - A Servicemen's Opportunity College provides special academic assistance to students in need of this assistance.

- By the designation of a trained "servicemen's counselor" who is available at times and in locations convenient to service men and women and who will assist them in program planning and guide them in their understanding of educational options available to them within the criteria observed by Servicemen's Opportunity Colleges.
- Through the availability of diagnostic or tutorial services, or similar learning assistance at times and in locations convenient to service men and women.
- Through the willingness to consider implementing a PREP program sponsored by the institution at the base, if appropriate.

Counselling. Describe the nature of counselling services available to service men and women:

Who is (are) the designated servicemen's counselor(s)?

Name	Title/phone

IV. (Cont.)

What counseling is available on base?

Tutorial etc. Describe briefly the nature of any diagnostic or tutorial services or other learning assistance available to service men and women. Which of these services are available on base?

PREP. What is the institution's policy or plans re sponsoring a PREP program if needed?

V. Credit for Learning from In-Service Educational Experience

Criterion V - A Servicemen's Opportunity College will recognize learning from educational experiences obtained in the Armed Services. It will recognize such learning consistent with standards of the programs it offers by the granting of credit for or exemption from courses relevant to a student's degree program. It will employ means such as:

- The use of United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI) courses.*
- The use of the College Level Examination Program (CLEP), the College Proficiency Examination Program (CPEP), Advanced Placement (AP), institutional or departmental "challenge" examinations, Military Subject Standardized Tests (SST).
- The evaluation for credit of military educational experiences in accordance with the recommendations in the American Council on Education's *Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services*.
- The exemption from or credit for required physical education courses for service men and women who have had at least one year of active military service.
- The acceptance of credit validated by the above means wherever equivalent and applicable to the programs of service men and women.

---

* USAFI was disestablished in May, 1974 and courses were discontinued. Records may be obtained from DANTES Transcripts, 2318 So. Park Street, Madison, WI 53713.

V. (Cont.)

Please indicate applicability of each of the following modes in the programs of service men and women.

Mode	Accepted by Institution (✓)		Maximum Credit Allowed (Sem. or qtr. hrs.?)
USAFI		*( )	
Military SST's		*( )	
CLEP (Gen'l. Exams)		*( )	
(Subj. Exams)		*( )	
CPEP (New York State)			
Advanced Placement			
Institutional or Departmental Challenge Exams			
ACE Guide Service			
Other (Correspondence)			
(Independent Study)**			

---

*( ) Indicate percentile required
** Non-residential

Physical Education. What is the institutional PE requirement?

Is exemption or waiver possible for service men and women on the basis of at least one year of service? ____ If credit is granted, what is the maximum allowable credit? ____

What is the total credit allowed for all of the modes in V above? ________

Are there any other limitations placed upon the acceptance or application of such credit? ____

VI. Adaptability of Requirements for Resident Study (e.g. number of credits, terms, or time spent in residence)

Criterion VI - A Servicemen's Opportunity College has requirements for resident study (e.g. on-campus or institutionally sponsored study) which are adaptable to the mobility and special needs of service men and women, such as:

- Resident study requirements based upon time spent on campus or minimum credits to be earned from the institution may be fulfilled at any time within their programs.
- Resident study requirements may be fulfilled by completion of any educational program sponsored by the institution whether offered on campus or off campus.
- Special options to satisfy resident study requirements will be made available to service men and women. Institutions may consider the following options:
  - A formal contract for degree option may be made available to service men and women. They may contract with a Servicemen's Opportunity College at any appropriate time; usually the contract will be with the college of their initial enrollment. The college will designate an advisor, who will assist the service man or woman in contracting for a degree with the institution. The contract should specify the course of study to be pursued and appropriate learning options in accordance with the Servicemen's Opportunity College Criteria. Prior approval by the contracting institution will be required for work taken subsequently from another institution when the service man or woman is forced to transfer as a result of a change in duty assignment.
  - As long as the service man or woman is being effectively guided by his or her advisor, transfer of appropriate credits earned at other institutions back to the original institution will be permitted - in essence, a reverse transfer policy.
  - The institution agrees to provide a repository for academic records of the individual. The contracting college will award the service man or woman the appropriate degree upon fulfillment of the contract.
- The college may waive or eliminate resident study requirements for service men and women or the college, if necessary, may elect to adjust the resident study requirement as may be justified upon petition by the individual service man or woman.
- Where resident study requirements are restricted by state law, the college will make every effort to obtain an exemption for service men and women.

VI. (Cont.)

Describe institutional resident study requirements.

Can this requirement be fulfilled at any time during a student's program? ____

Does all instruction offered or sponsored by the institution count toward the resident study requirement? ____ Be specific: Off-campus? ____ On base? ____ Other? ____________________

Do you have a "contract for degree" option similar to that suggested in Criterion VI? ____ If so, describe briefly.

Does the institution waive or eliminate the resident study requirement for service men and women as a group? ____

If conditions warrant, will the institution adjust or waive the requirement upon petition by the individual service man or woman? ____

Are institutional resident study requirements set by state law or code? ____ By the governing board? ____ By the institution itself? ____

VII. Credit Transfer Policy

Criterion VII - A Servicemen's Opportunity College is generous in recognition of credit obtained by service personnel from other regionally accredited institutions.

- It will accept for transferring service men and women the level of credit granted by other accredited institutions in which they have completed course work in comparable programs to the extent it is applicable to the receiving program, or
- The institution will make a special effort to evaluate or validate transfer credit about which there may be question (e.g. credit earned by non-traditional means*, credit from an institution whose accreditation is pending, etc.), or
- As a minimum, the institution will accept credits in question on a provisional basis subject to the student's success in continuing course work in the receiving program.

---

* In evaluating non-traditional credits, the institution may find helpful materials published by CAEL, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ 08540

VII. (Cont.)

Does the institution accept for transferring service men and women the level of credit granted by other accredited institutions in which they have completed course work in comparable programs to the extent it is applicable to the receiving program? ____

Are there limitations placed on transfer credit?
e.g., :

Is there a minimum grade or GPA requirement? ____ If so, what? ____ Is credit accepted for courses which are not part of your institution's curricular offerings? ____
Other? ____

Does the institution make a special effort to evaluate transfer credit about which there may be question (e.g. credit earned by non-traditional means, credit from an institution whose accreditation is pending, etc.)? ____
Describe:

Will the institution accept credits in question on a provisional basis subject to the student's success in continuing course work in the receiving program? ____

VIII. Liaison among Institutions and Military Bases

> Criterion VIII - A Servicemen's Opportunity College will establish liaison with the appropriate base education officers and representatives of the institutions which jointly serve or seek to serve a military installation to provide necessary planning and coordination of effort for that base.

Indicate to the best of your knowledge other institutions serving the same military base(s).

Describe liaison efforts between your institution and base(s) and among institutions serving the same base(s).

Is there a formal advisory structure in existence? ____
Describe.

If none exists, is your institution willing to join some form of liaison or coordinating group? ____

IX. Publicizing of SOC Opportunities

Criterion IX - A Servicemen's Opportunity College will publicize and promote its SOC policies by inserting them in its catalog and by other appropriate means.

Please enclose any catalog statements or other institutional materials pertaining to SOC or any of the Criteria above.

X. Continuity of Commitment

Criterion X - A Servicemen's Opportunity College will maintain its commitments to service men and women who have enrolled under these Criteria if for any reason it discontinues its status as a Servicemen's Opportunity College.

Is the institution prepared to continue its commitment to service men and women made under these Criteria even if later it withdraws from SOC? ____

Additional Information

Principal Supervisory Official.

It will be most helpful if the institution will designate a principal official (preferably from central administration) who will assume responsibility for implementation and oversight of the institution's commitment as a Servicemen's Opportunity College. This official is needed to serve as the institutional spokesman for information on institutional policy and practice and to provide for the distribution of SOC related information and material within the institution.

If feasible, please designate the official who is assuming responsibility for implementation and oversight of the institutional effort and commitment as a Servicemen's Opportunity College.

____
Name

____
Title

Education of Veterans.

Education of the veteran upon his or her return from service is an important continuation of the SOC effort on behalf of service men and women. Although developing a veterans program is not a SOC requirement, each institution is urged to assist returning service personnel to continue programs of study started while in service and wherever feasible to provide counselling and outreach programs to assist veterans to use education to return to a productive and satisfying civilian life.

Have you any special programs designed to meet the needs of veterans? ____ Counselling? ____ Work placement? ____
Describe briefly:

Does the institution qualify for a VCIP grant for 1976? ___

Is the institution approved for G.I. Bill entitlement (Title 38, U. S. Code)? ____ Any limitations or exclusions? ____________
____

Do you have a veterans affairs office? ____

Name and title of Director? ______________________________

Appendix C

SOC Advisory Board

SOC ADVISORY BOARD

Fiscal Year 1976

Honorable Hunter Andrews
State Senator
222 Queen Street
Hampton, Virginia 23369
(ECS)

Harry P. Bowes
President
University of Southern Colorado
Pueblo, Colorado 81001
(AASCU)

Thomas W. Carr
Director of Defense Education
Office of the Assistant Secretary
of Defense
Room 3D-262, The Pentagon
Washington, D. C. 20301
(OASD)

G. Bruce Dearing
Vice Chancellor for Academic
Programs
State University of New York
99 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12210
(NASULGC)

George J. Faul
President
Monterey Peninsula College
Monterey, California 93940
(AACJC)

Miles Fisher IV
Executive Secretary
National Association for Equal
Opportunity in Higher Education
2001 S Street, N. W.
Suite 450
Washington, D. C. 20009
(NAFEO)

William Gager
Director, DANTES
Building 995, Ellyson Center
Pensacola, Florida 32509
(DANTES)

William R. Graham
Superintendent - President
Barstow Community College
Barstow, California 92311
(AACJC)

Lt. Col. J. M. Keenan
Head, Education Services Branch
Code MTES, Headquarters
U. S. Marine Corps
Washington, D. C. 20380
(USMC)

William L. Maloy
Principal Civilian Advisor on
Education and Training
Staff, Chief of Naval Training
Code OIA, NAS
Pensacola, Florida 32508
(USN)

Jerry Miller
Director
Office of Commission on
Educational Credit
American Council on Education
Suite 800, One Dupont Circle
Washington, D. C. 20036
(ACE)

Brigadier General J. C. Penningt
Deputy, The Adjutant General
Forrestal Building
Washington, D. C. 20314
(USA)

Robert Quick
Chief, Education Services Branch
DPPEB - Dept AF
Room 4C-244, The Pentagon
Washington, D. C. 20330
(USAF)

Bevington Reed
Commissioner, Coordinating Board
Texas College and University Systems
P. O. Box 12788, Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78911
(SHEEO)

Robert N. Rue
President
Mohegan Community College
Norwich, Connecticut 06360
(AACJC)

Leonard Scofield
Associate Dean of Instruction
Burlington County College
Pemberton, New Jersey 08068
(AACJC)

J. Lem Stokes, II
Associate Vice President for
  Academic Affairs
University of North Carolina
  Systems Office
Box 307
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514
(AAU)

Patricia A. Thrash
Associate Executive Director
Commission on Institutions of
  Higher Education
North Central Association of Colleges
  and Secondary Schools
820 Davis Street
Evanston, Illinois 60201
(AAHE)

Horace Traylor
Dean, Development
Miami-Dade Junior College
Miami, Florida 33156
(AACJC)

Edward J. van Kloberg
Dean of Admissions, Financial
  Aid and Veterans Affairs
The American University
Washington, D. C. 20016
(AAC)

Thurman J. White
Vice President for Continuing
  Education - Public
  Service
The University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma 73069
(4 Year Institutions/by AASCU)

Robert J. Williams
Dean
Office of Relations with Schools
California State University/
  Northridge
Northridge, California 91324
(AACRAO)

10/75

Appendix D

ECS/SOC
National Task Force

[illegible]
of [illegible]
and [illegible]
Suite [illegible]
One [illegible]
Washington, [illegible] 20036
(20[illegible]

James F. Nickerson
Director/SOC

SERVICEMEN'S OPPORTUNITY COLLEGE

of Community and
Junior [illegible]
[illegible]
One [illegible]
Washington, D.C. [illegible]
(202) [illegible]

William F. [illegible]
Associate Director/SOC

Cooperating Agencies

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers

American Association for Higher Education

Association of American Universities

American Council on Education

Association of American Colleges

Education Commission of the States

Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education*

National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education

National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges

National Commission on Accrediting*

State Higher Education Executive Officers

U.S. Air Force

U.S. Army

U.S. Marine Corps

U.S. Navy

Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense

MEMORANDUM: ECS Task Force

FROM: James F. Nickerson
Director, SOC

Attached is a description of the national task force now being established by the Education Commission of the States (ECS) at the request of SOC. Its purpose is "to explore policy issues for institutions, states, and the federal government as these relate to planning, financing, continuity and mutual obligations to meet the educational needs of servicemen."

There are substantial issues relative to the decision-making and management of post-secondary institutions in serving the educational needs of military personnel whether by instruction carried to an installation or through many external study means now available through our institutions. The issues embrace public and private, lower division and upper division, and academic or technical, trade or vocational institutions. Similarly, there are problems of cost between public and private, four-year institutions and community colleges, etc. Then, too, there are 'jurisdictional' problems among in-state institutions, as well as the score or more of institutions which are bringing multi-state or world-wide educational service to Armed Services personnel.

Further problems arise when individual services contract with selected institutions or when colleges are approached by several of the services each asking or requiring different policies or practices.

Through such a task force it is hoped that a national and prestigious group representing governors, legislators, educational institutions, state agencies, the military services, and federal agencies such as the V.A. and O.E. can address these problems and offer guidelines for orderly development of civilian-military arrangements as civilian institutions assume their full responsibility in servicing military personnel wherever they may be assigned.

*now combined in the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation

The Education Commission of the States is a state-supported coalition of interests--governors, legislators, educators, professional associations, federal agencies, but with a primary focus on state responsibilities. Since post-secondary education is primarily a state responsibility, it is most appropriate for ECS to sponsor such a task force on our behalf.

TASK FORCE ON STATE, INSTITUTIONAL AND FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITIES IN PROVIDING POSTSECONDARY EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY TO SERVICE PERSONNEL

Among the continuing concerns facing institutions, the states, and the nation is that of increase of access to postsecondary education. Of particular importance to state and national interests is access to such education on the part of military personnel and the continuity of such education when such personnel leave the military service and become veterans. While there is more than a thirty-year history of voluntary cooperation between institutions and the armed forces, until relatively recently there has been little in the way of structured relations that would ensure continuity of programs, credits, records, and advisement.

Beginning in 1972, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges has through the two-year Serviceman's Opportunity College developed a network of junior and community colleges making special efforts to meet servicemen's needs. The institutions involved agreed to a set of criteria for more flexible means by which servicemen could satisfy admissions to programs, meet 'on-campus' residency requirements, complete interrupted work, validate much of service training and experience for credit, and related issues. The idea met with immediate acceptance by the military and the institutions. As a result in 1973 the four-year Serviceman's Opportunity College was inaugurated under the auspices of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities in cooperation with 12 other professional and educational organizations including the Education Commission of the States. The project was funded by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education and the Department of Defense. The Education Commission of the States endorsed the project and has a representative, Senator Hunter Andrews of Virginia (with Mr. Robert Corcoran as alternate) on the Advisory Board. The Commission has helped by distributing the Serviceman's Opportunity College catalogue to state officials. Chancellor Robert Mautz of the Florida University System, an ECS Commissioner, is also on the Advisory Board representing the State Higher Education Executive Officers. During the current year the two- and four-year Serviceman's Opportunity College projects have merged and the funding for the united project has been received and increased.

The timeliness of the Serviceman's Opportunity College and the issues with which it must deal is underlined by two conditions: the first is the change of national policy to depend upon all volunteer military services. Among other things this has caused a reassessment of the conditions and attractiveness of the services to potential volunteers. Educational opportunity has become a major concern of the military. The second is the continuing evolution in educational programs and instruction in educational institutions to meet the needs of today's students and previously unserved clienteles.

At the March meeting of the Steering Committee in Denver in 1973, Dr. James Nickerson, the Director of the Serviceman's Opportunity College (SOC) and at that time a non-voting commissioner representing the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, reported on the progress of SOC to date, and proposed the development of a joint SOC-ECS task force to explore policy issues for institutions, states, and the federal government (represented by the military) as these relate to planning, financing, continuity, and mutual obligations to meet the educational needs of servicemen. The Steering Committee endorsed the idea of such a task force and authorized its development as funding would permit.

The funds for this task force have been provided by the Carnegie Foundation to the Serviceman's Opportunity College. Accordingly, we propose to activate the task force. The purposes and charges of the task force are the following:

(1) To explore policy and procedural options for delegation of responsibility among educational institutions, state agencies, and the military services.

(2) To explore policy and procedural options for long-term financing of civilian education for military personnel.

(3) In this context of education of servicemen in civilian postsecondary institutions, to explore problems of transferability, extension of access, and program flexibility in postsecondary education as these relate to statewide and regional planning for postsecondary education and orderly decision making among institutions as they serve military personnel.

It is particularly important that the task force adequately represent the educational, military, state agency and political communities. Accordingly, the membership of the task force will include:

(1) A governor from a state with major military installations as chairman

(2) State Senator

(3) State Representative

(4) A State Higher Education Executive Officer

(5) A representative of community colleges

(6) A representative of postsecondary technical vocational education

(7) A representative of a state college or regional university

(8) A representative of a major national university

(9) A representative of private higher education

(10) A representative of the Office of Education

(11) A representative of the Veterans Administration

(12) A student Vietnam veteran

(13) Educational representatives of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines and Coast Guard

The task force will be appointed by the Commission in consultation with SOC, particularly in relation to the educational representatives of the military. The task force will be appointed during March and early April. The first meeting will be held in late April or early May. It is expected the task force will operate for 6 to 9 months with 4 to 6 meetings.

The task force will be staffed by Dr. Nickerson, Dr. Millard, and additional support staff from ECS and SOC to be reimbursed from consultants' funds provided in the SOC budget. SOC will act as the fiscal agent and will take care of all costs of meetings, travel, publications, and other expenses of the task force with the exception of the administrative services of the Director of Higher Education Services.

The task force will submit its report to the Steering Committee of the Education Commission of the States and the Advisory Board of the Serviceman's Opportunity College.

RMM
March 1975

Education Commission of the States
300 LINCOLN TOWER • 1860 LINCOLN STREET
(303) 893-5200 • DENVER, COLORADO 80203

TASK FORCE ON STATE, INSTITUTIONAL AND FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITIES IN PROVIDING POSTSECONDARY EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY TO SERVICE PERSONNEL

Chairman

The Honorable Edwin Edwards
Governor
State of Louisiana
State Capitol
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

Members

Honorable William Bittenbender
Chairman
State Board of Education
State House
Concord, New Hampshire 03301
(602) 225-9482

Dr. James Bond
President
California State University
at Sacramento
Sacramento, California 95819
(916) 454-6322

Dr. Howard Boozer
Executive Director
Commission on Higher Education
1429 Senate Street, Suite 1104
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
(803) 758-2407

Dr. Calvin Dellefield
Executive Director
National Advisory Council on
Vocational Education
425 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 412
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 962-0781

Mr. C. L. Dollarhide
Deputy Director, Education and
Rehabilitation Services
Veterans Administration
810 Vermont Avenue, N.W., Room 430
Washington, D.C. 20420
(202) 389-2152

Dr. T. Edward Hollander
Deputy Commissioner
Board of Regents, University
of the State of New York
State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224
(518) 474-5851

Dr. Louis Kaufman
Executive Vice Chancellor
Los Angeles Community College
System
2140 West Olympic Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90022
(213) 380-6000

Dr. Barbara Knudson
Dean, University College
University of Minnesota
105 Walter Library
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 373-4638

Dr. William L. Maloy
Principal
Civilian Advisor on Education and
Training
Naval Education and Training Command
Naval Air Station
Pensacola, Florida 32508
(904) 452-2180

Members (continued)

Honorable Lucille Maurer
Assemblywoman
State of Maryland
1023 Forest Glen Road
Silver Springs, Maryland 20901
(301) 593-4661

Dr. Willa B. Player
Director
Division of Institutional Development
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Office of Education
7th and D Street, S. W.
Room 4060
Washington, D.C. 20202
(202) 245-2239

Mr. Robert Raether
Member
National Association of Concerned Veterans
508 Wilson Avenue
Menomonie, Wisconsin 54751
(715) 235-2760

Honorable Jeanette F. Reibman
State Senator and Chairman, Education Committee
711 Lehigh Street
Easton, Pennsylvania 18042
(717) 787-4236

Dr. Prezell R. Robinson
President
Saint Augustines College
1315 Oakwood Avenue
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611
(919) 833-6401

Consultant Member

Dr. William Arceneaux
Commissioner of Higher Education
State Board of Regents
P.O. Box 44362--Capitol Station
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804
(504) 389-5206

RMM:mb
5/13/75

Appendix E

Report of Expenditures

Report of Expenditures - SOC
(October 1, 1974 through September 30, 1975)

Total Funds Received from Carnegie Corporation		$ 74,436
Less Cash Expenditures:		
Personnel	$ 22,463	
Services	2,160	
Office	7,760	
Travel	4,965	
Miscellaneous[1]	1,173	
Indirect Costs	1,926	(40,447)
Unexpended Funds		$ 33,989
Less estimated encumbrances		(12,238)
Total Funds available for future operations		$ 21,751

Updated Report of Expenditures - SOC
(October 1, 1974 through December 31, 1975)

Total Funds Received		$ 74,436
Less Cash Expenditures:		
Personnel	$ 29,955	
Services	2,160	
Office	10,616	
Travel	10,849	
Miscellaneous[1]	1,229	
Indirect Costs	2,740	57,549
Unexpended Funds		$ 16,887

---

[1] Item covers expenditures not allowed under federal regulations, e.g., hotels and food in excess of $25 per day, business entertainment costs (luncheons, etc.).